

SPECIAL MEETING: 6:00 P.M. to 6:45 P.M.

STUDY SESSION

Continued discussion and direction on Projects Status, Management and Reporting. (continued from 7/25)

Attended by Councilmembers Warden, Hahn, Rianda, Cook, Interim City Manager Lewcock, City Attorney Savaree, Interim Community Development Director Macris, Interim Assistant to the City Manager Bridges, Commander Mattei, Finance Director Fil, Principal Planner De Melo, Technology Specialist Harnish, Fire Chief Jewell, Deputy City Clerk Harrington.

C. Cook clarified that the purpose of this discussion was to insure there was a complete project list and Council would not prioritize the list at this time.

Interim City Manager Lewcock reviewed some of the discussion items from the July 25 meeting:

For the general plan, staff would put together a complete work program, which would include an acceleration of the housing element next year. The timing and sequence of the rest of the general plan would return to Council next Fall. The total general plan process would take three years. There would not be a significant start up until the new Community Development Director was on board.

For the Redevelopment Agency, staff would bring back earlier then scheduled, broad priorities and how to spend the bond proceeds.

Two new items were added to the list, Old County Road, and the Plaza Area at Old County Road and Ralston Avenue.

In response to C. Rianda's concern about creating a work plan for the new City Manager and Community Development Director when they were not here yet. Interim City Manager Lewcock stated Interim Community Development Director Macris could complete the work plan. Staff would wait until the new team was on board before it was sent back to Council.

Commander Mattei stated the projects for the Police Department 1). updating the animal control ordinance to be in line with the County; 2). Buckman Radio Site negotiations with the Water District for use of the property; 3). Mobile Data Terminals, units for police vehicles to communicate with the police station, Fieldworks, Inc. recalled the computers due to a software problem; 4). Trigger Lock Program, a policy needs to be formulated to train people when the locks are distributed. The Police Department is looking for a gun lock that is common to a large variety of guns.

Finance Director Fil stated the projects for the Finance Department: 1). Belmont Fire Protection District funding, expected a draft report from the auditors, would analyze the recommendations and conduct public workshops; 2). Sewer/Storm Drain fees, project implemented; 3). Master Fee Schedule Review, adoption expected January, 2001 4). Risk Management Study, reviewing RFP's; 5). GASB 34 Implementation a Federal/County mandate which would rewrite the rules for the way the City reports certain assets and liabilities, multi-year project to be implemented by July 1, 2002; 6). Purchasing Ordinance Update to be implemented by

July 2001; 7). New Library/Belameda Park, working on design and cost elements; 7). Strategic Finance Plan, develop a multi-year financial plan, to look at current operations, infrastructure and capital improvements.

In response to C. Cook, Finance Director Fil stated that the milestones would be changed for the Library/Belameda Park project.

Fire Chief Jewell stated the Fire Station 14 Reconstruction project would be reviewed by the Council and Planning Commission in the Fall.

Interim City Manager Lewcock stated the projects for the City Manager's Department included: 1). Belmont City News, drafts would be distributed for the Fall edition; 2). Cablecasting Council meetings, implemented; 3). Cable TV Proposal, another franchise is interested in servicing Belmont; 4). Legislative Calendar Process, presentation when a new City Manager is hired; 5). HIA Annexation, study moving forward; 6). Technology Master Plan.

Interim City Manager Lewcock suggested adding to the list in the latter part of the year: 1). revision to employee handbook; 2). update to personnel policies and procedures manual; 3). Council direction on the budget message which included a recommendation to add revenues, and belt tightening in certain areas, and possible budget reductions.

In response to C. Rianda, Interim City Manager Lewcock stated that when new projects come up, Council may decide what projects will be impacted, which may be dropped, and which will remain in the workplan.

Mr. Lawhern, 408 Hiller, requested that the Old County Road/Ralston Avenue Plaza Project be given a higher priority and a new timeframe. He thought, at a minimum, landscaping should be placed in the corner immediately.

Interim City Manager Lewcock, stated that the Request for Proposals for Block 4 were being reviewed. He reported that the soonest staff could address the Old County Road/Ralston Avenue Plaza Project would be in September. He thought if Council moved this project forward, they would have to move another project back, due to Community Development's current work load and staff shortage.

Council discussed whether to hire a consultant to start this project and reprioritize other projects.

C. Warden suggested a sub-committee of Commissioners to work on a conceptual outline.

Interim City Manager Lewcock stated staff would move forward with this project.

ADJOURNMENT at this time being 6:45 P.M.

Sheila Harrington

Deputy City Clerk

Meeting Tape Recorded

Tape No. 471a

CLOSED SESSION 6:50 P.M.

A. Conference with Legal Counsel, anticipated litigation, pursuant to Government Code Section 54956.9:

1. One Case

Attended by Councilmembers Warden, Hahn, Rianda, Cook, Interim City Manager Lewcock and City Attorney Savaree. Deputy City Clerk Harrington was excused from attending.

Adjournment at this time, being 7:00 P.M. this Closed Session was adjourned.

Sheila Harrington

Deputy City Clerk

Meeting not tape recorded.

REGULAR MEETING - 8:10 P.M.

ROLL CALL

COUNCILMEMBERS PRESENT: Warden, Hahn, Rianda, Cook

COUNCILMEMBERS ABSENT: Wright

Staff Present: Interim City Manager Lewcock, Assistant to the City Manager Bridges, City Attorney Savaree, Interim Community Development Director Macris, Finance Director Fil, Assistant City Engineer Jones, Police Commander Mattei, Fire Chief Jewell, Technology Specialist Harnish, Principal Planner De Melo, Senior Planner Livingstone, Deputy City Clerk Harrington

PUBLIC/COUNCIL COMMENTS

Mr. McLaughlin, 3313 Plateau Drive, stated his concern about large trucks blocking the street for hauling and excavation for a project on Upper Locke. He asked for City staff to look into this problem. Mr. McLaughlin suggested putting "Beautiful Belmont" on the Village Center Wall.

Ms. Allen, 907 Alameda, invited everyone to attend the Relay for Life, American Cancer Society event on August 12 at Carlmont High School, beginning at 2:00 p.m.

Duncan Jones, Assistant City Engineer, announced that two out of the three Belmont projects that staff submitted made it on the draft list for Transportation Fund for Clean Air grants. Bicycle lockers for \$60,000 and the Chula Vista Traffic Calming Plan for \$170,000.

AGENDA AMENDMENTS

Per the Redevelopment Agency action, the Emmett House Resolution was continued.

CONSENT CALENDAR

Approval of meeting minutes: Special Meeting 7/19/00; Special and Regular Meeting of 7/25/00.

Approval of Warrant List Dated: July 14, 2000 in total amount of \$193,970.75 and dated July 21, 2000 in total amount of \$299,359.02 and dated July 27, 2000 in total amount of \$400,500.74.

Written Communication 1). Applic. of PG&E, for a permit to construct a realignment of the Colusa Jct.-Knights Landing Jct. 60kV Power Line in Yolo Co, Per GO 131-D, A.97-12-014; 2). Notice of applic. for an electric revenue increase: electric restructuring cost account (ERCA) Applic. (PG&E).

Motion to approve Claims Management Report. (None)

CONTINUED Resolution approving an amount not to exceed \$326,826 for the renovation of the Emmett House at 843 Ralston Avenue and making Findings pursuant to Health and Safety Code Section 33445.

Resolution No. 8805 approving a City-Wide Public Records Retention and Destruction Policy.

Resolution No. 8806 approving purchase of Geographic Information System (GIS) software and hardware in the amount of \$14,067.09 from Environmental Systems Research Institute, Inc. (ESRI INC.)

Resolution No. 8807 amending Exhibit A to Resolution 8786, approving Memorandum Of Understanding between the City and the Belmont Police Officers Association.

Proclamation of Appreciation to Mid-Peninsula Water District.

Resolution No. 8808 authorizing the City Manager to execute a Professional Services Agreement with Moreland & Associates for Accounting Services.

Resolution No. 8809 authorizing payment for Change Order No. 113 for an Amount not to Exceed \$121,815.00 for Valley Gutter behind MSE Wall M3, Ralston/Harbor/Holly Grade Separation Project, Phase B, Kiewit Pacific Corp., City Contract No. 330-B.

Resolution No. 8810 authorizing Professional Services Agreements with Belmont Chamber of Commerce; Center for Domestic Violence Prevention; Criminal Justice Council of San Mateo; Family and Community Enrichment Services, Inc.; Human Investment Project for Housing; Kollage; Peninsula Conflict Resolution Center; San Mateo County Convention and Visitors Bureau; San Mateo County Historical Association; San Mateo County Jobs for Youth; San Juan Canyon Preservation and Trust; Shelter Network; Sustainable San Mateo County; and the 75th Anniversary Committee; totaling \$187,752.00.

Resolution No. 8811 approving a Permanent Encroachment Agreement for the construction of a 2 foot high retaining wall within the public right of way at 1710 Terrace Drive. Mr. Lee, APN: 044-331-160.

Resolution No. 8812 approving a Permanent Encroachment Agreement for the construction of two keystone retaining wall within the public right of way at 2603 Monserat Avenue. Mr. Tayjasanent, APN 043-181-200.

Consent Calendar approved as amended. Moved by C. Warden, seconded by C. Hahn, and approved unanimously, by show of hands, with C. Wright absent.

HEARINGS

Hearing on appeal by Mr. Ratcliff to action taken by Planning Commission at meeting held on July 5, 2000 on application for a Conditional Use Permit and design review application for a Sprint Telecommunications Facility at 1070 Sixth Avenue.

Principal Planner De Melo presented the staff report recommending that Council uphold the Planning Commission decision. He noted that during the Planning Commission process, the applicant provided an RF Certification letter stating that the site would meet the Federal Communication Commission's RF emission guidelines. Principal Planner De Melo stated that the applicant modified their plan to use six flush mounted antennas to the exterior building wall. Two feet, ten inches of the antenna would project past the building parapet wall. The Planning Commission voted 5/0 to approve the conditional use permit and design review application.

Principal Planner De Melo stated that if a telecommunications facility meets the site compliance criteria in accordance with the FCC Emission Guidelines a legislative body could only regulate the aesthetic issues in relation to the proposal.

Staff prepared modified findings, if the Council upholds the Planning Commission decision, the findings address the outstanding aesthetic concerns.

Principal Planner De Melo showed Council photo-simulations of what the building would look like with the antennas.

Mr. Ratcliff, 1308 Sunnyslope, expressed his concern about emissions and cited various publications, cities with moratoriums and doctors who agreed.

Mr. Ratcliff stated that regular RF goes through people, microwave is absorbed by water, the brain is 90% water, which is why people have problems with microwave. Mr. Ratcliff stated that the FCC regulations for a safe amount are for one time exposure, it's not for chronic exposure or for pulsed microwave. He stated that if Belmont accepted money for the antennas, then Belmont would be held liable in lawsuits. Mr. Ratcliff noted that Senator Hayden has introduced SB6099 to study the effects of microwave.

Mr. Ratcliff recommended that the City Council put the decision off until more information is found.

In response to C. Cook, City Attorney Savaree stated that under the Telecommunications Act the Federal Government would set the standards for acceptable levels of the discharge from the facility, that is not something that Council could review. She further stated that in this instance there is a study that the applicant provided that demonstrated that this facility falls within an acceptable level, as far as the federal government is concerned. If Council denied the application based on health concerns, an applicant would have the right to file a lawsuit or appeal it to the FCC. City Attorney Savaree stated that Belmont's ordinance was drafted when the Telecommunications Act was enacted, in 1996, and made a concerted effort to place as many controls on these providers as possible to meet the aesthetic concerns which have been left to local zoning bodies.

City Attorney Savaree stated that the resolution before Council was a very exhaustive discussion of each standard and staff's interpretation of why the application meets the site standards. Staff could not take a position on the health concerns, because per the federal legislation neither staff nor the Council had the authority to review the health concerns.

C. Rianda suggested Council write a letter to the FCC to review the guidelines of the level emissions and in support of the health concerns stated at this meeting.

Action: on motion by C. Warden, seconded by C. Hahn and approved unanimously, by show of hands, with C. Wright absent to adopt:

Resolution No. 8813 upholding the Planning Commission's decision to approve a Conditional Use Permit and Design Review to allow a Sprint PCS Wireless Communication Facility at 1070 Sixth Avenue (Appl. No. 00-1018)

Council concurred, with C. Wright absent, to send a letter to the FCC stating their concerns.

Hearing on appeal by Mr. Andrews to action taken by Planning Commission at meeting held on July 5, 2000 on application for Floor Area Ratio Exception and single Family Design Review application granted to M/M Hawley concerning property located at 819 Miramar Terrace, being Lot 5, Subdivision Miramar Heights APN: 045-140-210.

City Attorney Savaree recused herself (Law partner Ken Dickerson owns property within 300 feet of the subject property) and introduced Jerry Coleman retired City Attorney for Burlingame to serve as legal counsel for this agenda item.

Principal Planner De Melo presented the staff report recommending upholding the Planning Commission's decision to approve the floor area exception and design review applications. The applicant proposed a 1,324 s.f. ground floor and second story addition to an existing 2,874 s.f. home, the new total would be 4,198 s.f. where the maximum permitted is 3,500 s.f.

The Planning Commission reviewed this project three times, and Planner De Melo felt that the Commission was comfortable with the aggregate amount of square footage that was proposed as part of the floor area exception. The applicant held meetings with the neighbors to address their concerns and reduced the square footage of the addition, relocated a portion of the second story to the rear of the home, and reduced the aggregate height of the second story. The Planning Commission voted 3/1 to approve the floor area exception and design review application.

Principal Planner De Melo requested Council to make a specific finding if they choose to overturn the Planning Commission decision.

Mayor Cook opened the public hearing.

Speaking in favor of the project:

Kimberly Rusch, 2119 Coronet Blvd.

Michelle Semmler, 15 Kimmie Court

Jeannette & David Tuhtan, 2420 Lincoln Avenue

Jesse & Frances Patterson, address unknown

Jill & Larry Patterson, 9290 Tanglewood Way, Sacramento

Robert Benner, 2112 Coronet Boulevard

Charlie Jiang, 819 Miramar Terrace

Tom Lee, 2617 Monte Cresta Drive

David & Carolyn Miclean, 93 Ralston Ranch Road

David & Joan Hendershott, 1905 Valdez

Reiner Lenigk, 2103 Coronet Boulevard

Shelley Frost, 2404 DeKoven

Fritz Schlatter, 1526 Ridge Road

Phil Yeater, 3400 Beresford

Speakers comments included:

The Hawleys would be a great asset to the neighborhood, Craftsman style home would fit in, project thoughtfully planned to accommodate several generations and physical disabilities, Planning Commission deliberations were honest, open and fairly discussed, concerned about process people have to go through to remodel a home in Belmont, the size and look of the home fits in beautifully in the neighborhood, lots similar in size, wonder what the agenda is for this situation, the new house would not look substantially different in terms of elevation from the street in comparison to 808 Miramar, worried about the process for other people who might remodel.

Speaking against the project:

Art Andrews, 816 Miramar Terrace, appellant, asked Council to reverse the FAR exception, He presented Council with an assessor parcels map which indicated which residents signed the appeal or signed the request that the Planning Commission deny the request for the FAR exception. Of the 26 homes, 8 were not approached, 3 abstained, 1 had a conflict of interest, 14 of the 17 remaining homes have formally objected to the variance, 8 other nearby homes on South Road, Holly Road and Southview Court have formally objected for a total of 22 objections. Mr. Andrews cited The Codes Covenants and Restrictions for the Miramar Heights neighborhood, approval of plans and regulations for placing of a building, the plans are to be approved by the majority of a homeowners committee. Mr. Andrews would like to explore alternatives for a win-win situation.

Liz Wiecha, 860 Miramar Terrace, Planning Commissioner, concerned with bulk of the house and the impact it will have on public views from the street. Project does not meet the necessary criteria for granting a FAR exception. Ms. Wiecha created charts for Council which diagrammed the building sizes on Miramar Terrace and the adjacent houses on Holly Street, the building size included the garage space. Buildings of 3,500 s.f. are the top 20% of the neighborhood with floor area ratios of .21. She stated this project was not lessening an inconsistency. Ms. Wiecha stated that design alternatives were available.

Bill Moore, 892 Holly Road

Warren Lieberman, 824 Miramar Terrace,

Eleanor Koch, 848 Miramar Terrace

Julie Leach, 640 South Road

Wes Dong, 860 Miramar Terrace

Linda Judge, 831 Miramar Terrace (Spoke on behalf of Pat Kozub of 837 Miramar Terrace)

Gifford Calenda, 856 Miramar Terrace

Robert Ledoux, 840 Miramar Terrace, spoke on behalf of the broad neighborhood opposition, stated the proposed project was not in conformity with the original Codes Covenants and Restrictions of the neighborhood. The house would be 20% larger than what the lot is zoned for and the FAR ratio would be the third largest in the area. Mr. Ledoux stated there was not a compelling reason to grant a variance in this situation. The neighbors feel there was room for compromise.

Speakers comments included:

Existing law needs to be upheld, large and bulky house, eliminates public views, need to find compromise that blends in with the neighborhood, proposed house would overpower the rest, the proposed addition would result in a monster house which would be out of character for the neighborhood, character of the neighborhood would be destroyed,

David Hawley, 819 Miramar Terrace, Applicant, presented a petition to Council in support of the project, signed by 11 households in the effected area and 20 from other households in Belmont. Mr Hawley presented pictures to Council of neighborhood houses. The Hawley's met individually with concerned neighbors, and they developed an alternative plan with their architect to address these issues. The maximum floor area for their side of the street is 3,500 s.f., for the other side it is 4,500. Mr. Hawley stated the proposed project is consistent with properties on both sides of Miramar Terrace, when porch areas are not counted. He cited 808 Miramar Terrace, the Lieberman and Shue homes as examples.

Mr. Hawley stated that they complied with design review, the building is not on a ridge line, the view down the driveway is fully preserved, and improved the view over the corner of the house. He stated that the Planning Commission and the City Planner determined that this was not a significant view, but they have tried to preserve it.

They were sensitive to the concerns of adjacent neighbors and the neighbors across the street, made modifications to improve the view of the Bay from the street and the design accomplishes the objectives of both the FAR and the design review process, as well as the General Plan. Mr. Hawley requested the City Council uphold the decision of the Planning Commission.

Carter Warr, CJW Architecture, 130 Portola Road, Portola Valley, Architect for applicant, reviewed the history of the project. Three Planning Commission meetings were held and meetings with the neighbors.. The Hawley's made numerous revisions to the original plans based on these meetings. Mr. Warr stated that a major part of the floor area was 404 s.f. of covered porch and the actual house size was 3,300 s.f. Most of the floor area that's represented in other homes that considered to be in parity do not include the floor area of a covered porch.

Mr. Warr asked the Council to affirm the Planning Commission decision.

Recess

Mayor Cook recessed the meeting at 9:45 P.M.

Reconvened

The meeting was reconvened at 9:55 P.M.

CONSENT CALENDAR

C. Cook presented a Proclamation of Appreciation to President Wagenseller of the Mid-Peninsula Water District.

Mayor Cook resumed the Public Hearing.

David Hawley, 819 Miramar Terrace, Applicant, stated he did not think this house would be a monster house. He thought he was stuck in the middle trying to make all the neighbors happy. This was their dream house that would address their personal and medical needs. They spent 150 hours and \$25,000 on this process. His family has been impacted by this process.

In response to C. Warden, Mr. Hawley stated they did minimal investigation on the house due to the real estate market.

Lynn Hawley, 819 Miramar Terrace, Applicant, stated her mother is blind, she is half blind, and her daughter has cataracts in both eyes. The most natural light, from all sides, that they can get into their home benefits them. They built a downstairs bedroom and bath for her parents to provide privacy. The other three bedrooms were on the top floor with a common landing. The house was designed with a straight forward plan, no angles, turns or corners to help the sight impaired.

On motion by C. Warden and seconded by C. Rianda, and approved by Council, with C. Wright absent, to close the public hearing.

C. Hahn, stated she spent 45 minutes with the applicant and was impressed that the roofline of this project graduated down from the next highest roofline with the three houses in a row. She stated that the project met the setbacks and the minimum roofline. She thought if there was mature landscaping in front, it would be difficult to criticize the roofline.

C. Cook stated she had spent time with the applicant and did not have a problem with the FAR exception. The main issue was the public and private view. The view issue was part of the design review ordinance. She could see both sides of the issues.

C. Warden stated he spent time with the applicant and the neighbors. He had an issue with the FAR. He stated this property was zoned R1A, it did not matter what the other side of the street was zoned. C. Warden stated that a covered porch contributed bulk, and he thought the house was a little too big.

C. Rianda stated that of the four necessary findings she could only make three of them. She could not make the finding for the FAR and felt they had to abide by the law. C. Rianda stated that the applicant needed to bring something that collaborates the FAR and then she could approve the project.

Action: on motion by C. Warden, seconded C. Rianda and approved unanimously, by show of hands with C. Wright absent to adopt:

Resolution No. 8814 upholding the appeal and overturning the Planning Commission's decision to approve a floor area ratio exception and design review at 819 Miramar Terrace (Appl. No. 00-1023)

Recess

Mayor Cook recessed the meeting at 10:20 P.M.

Reconvened

The meeting was reconvened at 10:25 P.M.

At this time being 10:30 P.M. On motion by C. Warden, seconded by C. Hahn to consider items 6-a, 5-c, and 6-c and to continue the rest of the agenda items to the next City Council meeting, approved unanimously by Council with C. Wright absent.

CONSIDERED OUT OF ORDER

OLD BUSINESS

Consideration of Resolution approving a change in the BFI Collection services to same-day service for garbage, recycling, and yard waste; and approving a change to two on-call annual clean up service.

C. Rianda confirmed that the on-call clean up service was less costly then the annual clean up service.

Action: On motion by C. Warden, seconded by C. Rianda and approved unanimously by show of hands, with C. Wright absent, to adopt:

Resolution No. 8815 approving a change in the BFI Collection services to same-day service for garbage, recycling, and yard waste, and approving a change to two on-call annual clean-up services.

This will be effective, February 1, 2001.

HEARINGS

Call up pursuant to Municipal Code Section 1-11 regarding 1525 Escondido Way to consider review of Planning Commission action of July 18, 2000. Item 7-B Public Hearing. Planning Commission Resolution No. 2000-40 approving a Floor Area Ratio Exception and design review at 1525 Escondido Way to add 994 square feet to an existing house for a total of 5,380 square feet. Application No. 00-1047, APN: 045-102-220, Zoning: R-1H, CEQA Status: Exempt, Applicant: Daniel Biermann, Design Studio, Owners Jim and Kim Richardson.

Principal Planner De Melo stated the applicant was proposing a 994 s.f. second story addition to an existing 4,386 s.f. home, the proposed new total would be 5,380 s.f. where the maximum permitted was 4,500 s.f. Principal Planner De Melo pointed out that any covered height less than 6'9" was not counted as floor area. The applicant had proposed reducing the height of 520 s.f. of the basement to eliminate that area as being counted as floor area. The proposed new total would be 4,860 s.f. which is 360 s.f. over the maximum of 4,500 s.f. The Commission approved the application to allow the entire addition without having to fill in the basement. The floor area exception was granted for 880 s.f. over the 4,500 s.f. cap.

Principal Planner De Melo stated there were two Resolutions for Council to consider one that upholds the Planning Commission decision to allow 880 s.f., or overturn the decision and consider a floor area exception of 360 s.f.

C. Warden clarified that if Council overturned the decision and allowed the floor area exception of 360 s.f., the applicant would not have to go back to Planning Commission and this action would approve the original application that was presented to the Commission.

In response to C. Hahn, Principal Planner De Melo stated that the entire basement and garage area consisted of 1,500 s.f. of the existing 4,386 for the home.

Mrs. Richardson, 1525 Escondido Way, applicant, stated she wanted to expand her home to make more room for her four children. She noted that the neighbors supported the plan. They have a 37,000 s.f. lot with huge setbacks and would not obstruct any views. Mrs. Richardson stated that she did not think Council would be setting a precedent. Her basement floods every year and she would never use it for living space. She felt her situation warranted an exception. Mrs. Richardson stated that they had 2,700 s.f. of living area and needed more.

Mr. Peirona, 1556 Sunnyslope Avenue, Planning Commissioner, stated he did not believe the Planning Commission was setting precedence based on 1). size of the lot, 2). subterranean garage/basement of 1,500 s.f. and 3). setback of over 100 feet. He searched Metroskan with the criteria of Belmont, lots of 36,000 s.f. or more, and R1. Metroskan showed 29 homes that fit that description. He stated that if the subterranean basement had not been counted then they would be below the 4,500 s.f. He thought this was a unique situation.

On motion by C. Warden and seconded by C. Cook to close the hearing, Council concurred with C. Wright absent.

C. Warden stated that Belmont was filled with unique lots. He stated the issue was not FAR, the issue was the maximum size, capped at 4,500 s.f. C. Warden feared that Planning Commission was setting policy by approving a house 5, 000+ s.f. when the maximum was 4,500 s.f. C. Warden stated this set a precedent and it sent the wrong message to staff.

C. Cook stated she thought this property had a lot of mitigations, a large lot, no effect on the views, neighbors were in favor, no trees removed or grading needed. She thought the mitigation of eliminating some of the square feet was a good condition to set, and the FAR was not a problem.

C. Warden stated he was in favor of staff's original recommendation, and had no problem granting an FAR exception for the 360 s.f.

Action: On motion by C. Warden, seconded by C. Rianda, and approved unanimously by show of hands, with C. Wright absent to adopt:

Resolution No. 8816 overturning the Planning Commission's decision to approve an 880 square foot floor area ratio exception and design review at 1525 Escondido Way (Appl. No. 00-1047), and approved a 360 square foot floor area exception and design review at 1525 Escondido Way.

City Attorney Savaree clarified that Council made the findings to support the floor area exception and design review provided that the applicant reduced the basement area.

Discussion and direction regarding Commission Appointments.

C. Cook stated there was one seat on the Planning Commission and four applicants, one seat for Park and Recreation and two applicants, two seats for Arts Commission and three applicants.

Council directed staff to set up a date for interviews with all of the candidates.

Harbor Industrial Annexation Study Work Plan.

This item was continued to August 22, 2000

BOARD, COMMISSION, COMMITTEE UPDATES, AND STAFF REPORTS

Direction regarding designation of voting delegate for League of California Cities Annual Conference.

Overview of process for RCN Telecommunications Services of California.

These items were continued to August 22, 2000.

MATTERS OF COUNCIL INTEREST/CLARIFICATION

**Request that Council authorize Council Members Rianda and Wright to continue meeting
with Youth Sport Organizations. (Rianda)**

Request to consider televising Council Study Sessions.(Warden)

These items were continued to August 22, 2000.

ADJOURNMENT at this time being 10:55 P.M. this meeting was adjourned.

Sheila Harrington

Deputy City Clerk

Meeting Tape Recorded and Televised

Tape No. 471